1 2 3 4	DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP THOMAS R. BURKE (State Bar No. 1419) thomasburke@dwt.com 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 800 San Francisco, CA 94111-6533 Telephone: (415) 276-6500 Fax: (415) 276-6599	930)
5 6 7 8 9	DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP DAN LAIDMAN (State Bar No. 274482) danlaidman@dwt.com DIANA PALACIOS (State Bar No. 29092 dianapalacios@dwt.com 865 South Figueroa Street, 24th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017-2566 Telephone: (213) 633-6800 Fax: (213) 633-6899	3)
10 11	Attorneys for Defendant Joseph Teixeira	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
14		
15	CITY OF INGLEWOOD, a public entity,	Case No. 2:15-cv-01815-MWF-MRW
16	Plaintiff,	Assigned to the Hon. Michael Fitzgerald
17	VS.)) DEFENDANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL
18	JOSEPH TEIXEIRA and Does 1-10,	REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE; SUPPLEMENTAL
19	Defendants.) DECLARATION OF JOSEPH) TEIXEIRA WITH EXHIBIT G
20) Hearing Date: June 22, 2015
21) Time: 10:00 a.m. Courtroom: 1600
22))
23		Action Filed: March 12, 2015
2425	<u> </u>)
26		
27		
28		
20		

Pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, Defendant Joseph Teixeira respectfully requests that this Court take judicial notice of copyright registration applications submitted by the City of Inglewood (the "City"), and referenced in the Complaint. True and correct copies of these applications are attached as **Exhibit G** to the Supplemental Declaration of Joseph Teixeira.

The City specifically identifies the applications in the Complaint, and relies on them for its claim of copyright infringement. See Cmplt. ¶ 14, p. 9 (Cmplt. Ex. A). Consequently, they are proper subjects of judicial notice. See Campbell v. Walt Disney Co., 718 F. Supp. 2d 1108, 1111 n.3 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (taking judicial notice of materials incorporated by reference in complaint that form basis for copyright claim); Sobhani v. @radical.media, Inc., 257 F. Supp. 2d 1234, 1236 n.1 (C.D. Cal. 2003) (same); Warren v. Fox Family Worldwide, Inc., 171 F. Supp. 2d 1057, 1062 (C.D. Cal. 2001) (taking judicial notice of copyright registration materials).

The applications are relevant to Mr. Teixeira's Motion to Strike, which seeks to strike the City's Request for Attorneys' Fees based on its failure to register the underlying works prior to commencement of the purported infringement or within three months after first publication of the works, as required under Section 412 of the Copyright Act. See Dkt. #8 (Motion to Strike). The applications show that they were submitted on February 2, 2015, and received by the Copyright Office on February 3, 2015, which is after the commencement of the purported infringement, and beyond three months after first publication of the works. Id.; Ex. G.

Although the City referenced the applications in the Complaint and relied on them for its claim, the City did not actually attach the applications to its pleading, and did not identify when the applications were filed. After being served with the Complaint, Mr. Teixeira submitted a request for copies of the applications on April 1, 2015, pursuant to the California Public Records Act ("CPRA"). See Dkt. # 9-1 (Teixeira Decl. ¶ 10). He received no response from the City as of the filing of his Motion to Dismiss and Motion to Strike on April 17, 2015. Id.; Supplemental

Teixeira Decl. ¶ 2. The City subsequently responded to Mr. Teixeira's CPRA request and provided the applications to him after his Motions had been filed. Id. ¶ 2 3. Because the applications are the City's own records, which it provided to Mr. 3 Teixeira after his Motions were filed, there is no prejudice to the City from the Court 4 taking judicial notice of these records at this time.¹ 5 For the reasons set forth above, Mr. Teixeira respectfully requests that this 6 Court take judicial notice of Exhibit G. 7 8 DATED: May 1, 2015 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP 9 THOMAS R. BURKE 10 DAN LAIDMAN DIANA PALACIOS 11 12 By: /s/ Dan Laidman 13 Dan Laidman 14 15 Attorneys for Defendant Joseph Teixeira 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 ¹ The City has until May 18, 2015, to file its opposition papers per the parties' stipulated briefing schedule, which this Court has approved. <u>See</u> Dkt. # 13.